



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/884,044

06/27/97

ANDREAS

S

2871US

WMS1/1101

SANJAY PRASAD  
FENWICK & WEST  
TWO PALO ALTO SQUARE SUITE 700  
PALO ALTO CA 94306

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED:

11/01/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**08/884,044**

Applicant(s)  
**Schilling; Knittel**

Examiner  
**Thu Nguyen**

Group Art Unit  
**2779**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thu Nguyen

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) John Carr (Registration No. 42390)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Oct 12, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:

Grammy: High Performance Graphics Using Graphics Memories and Texram: A Smart Memory for Texturing

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant explains that the two publications above is written by the same inventors as the present application. Applicant, further, points out that rejection under 35 USC 102(b) on the publication "Grammy: High Performance Graphics Using Graphics Memories" is improper because the publication is published less than a year from the filing date. Examiner acknowledges that the present application should be rejected under 35 USC 102(a) instead of 35 USC 102(b) in view of the "Grammy: High Performance Graphics Using Graphics Memories" publication. However, examiner asserts that rejection under 35 USC 102 (a) on the two publications is proper, because the publications have different entities from the present application. Applicant explains that the person whose name is not in the present application is not the inventor and who is not the person who makes the invention disclosed in the publications. Applicant is advised to file a 37 CFR 1.132 affidavit to traverse examiner's grounds of rejection established on those two publications.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Nguyen Thu

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.